

FFY 2015 Attachment 4.11(a) – Results of Comprehensive Statewide Assessment of the Rehabilitation Needs of Individuals with Disabilities and Need to Establish, Develop, or Improve Community Rehabilitation Programs

Introduction

The last comprehensive statewide needs assessment (CSNA) conducted by Washington State Department of Social and Health Services/Division of Vocational Rehabilitation (DSHS/DVR) was in FFY 2009 and updated in 2010. In FFY 2012, DSHS/DVR provided an assurance to conduct a comprehensive statewide needs assessment during FFY 2013 which is reflected within this attachment. This comprehensive assessment was completed in FFY 2014.

Results of this CSNA have been incorporated throughout DSHS/DVR's FFY 2014-2015 State Plan-~~Update~~, particularly in goals, priorities and strategies for the coming year and beyond.

DSHS/DVR conducted the CSNA in partnership with the Washington State Rehabilitation Council (WSRC) and the TACE Northwest and the University of Washington Center for Continuing Education in Rehabilitation (CCER). DSHS/DVR, WSRC, and CCER have established a joint CSNA Steering Committee to guide overall implementation of the statewide assessment and analysis of its results.

Sources Utilized

1. US Census Bureau 2011 American Community Survey (ACS), 1 year estimates
2. US Social Security Administration (SSA) data for 2011
3. Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) data for 2011
4. DSHS/DVR case service data for FFY 2011
5. 2011 Customer Satisfaction Survey conducted by the Washington State Rehabilitation Council (WSRC)
6. WSRC Quarterly Customer Forums
7. DSHS/DVR Monthly Survey of Customers with Closed Cases
8. Public Comments – State Plan

~~In addition to the current CSNA results, DSHS/DVR, WSRC and CCER are continuing a deeper identification and analysis of the VR needs of individuals with disabilities in Washington State that will be conducted during FFY 2014. This effort will include conducted a series of targeted surveys that CCER will conduct with DSHS/DVR customers, staff, and collateral service providers, DSHS/DVR staff and individuals knowledgeable about the employment and related needs of individuals with disabilities in the state. Results from this additional assessment will be incorporated in to the FFY 2015 State Plan Update.~~

FFY 2015 Attachment 4.11(a) – Results of Comprehensive Statewide Assessment of the Rehabilitation Needs of Individuals with Disabilities and Need to Establish, Develop, or Improve Community Rehabilitation Programs

DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE

According to the 2011 ACS estimates:

836,500 (12.4%) individuals of all ages with disabilities were residing in Washington State. Regarding gender, disability was more prevalent for men age 64 and under (15.6%) than for women age 64 and under (13.0%).

708,900 (20.7%) individuals, of working age people (ages 16 to 64) in Washington State report having a disability. These working age individuals with disabilities represent the primary segment of the state population who may qualify for vocational rehabilitation services.

The prevalence of disability associated with race or ethnicity in Washington State indicate the highest prevalence of disability in the Native American or Alaskan Native population with 20.6%; followed in descending order by White, 15.1%; Black/African American, 12.3%; Other, 9.0%; Hispanic, 7.3%; and Asian, 7.1%.

Ambulatory disabilities were the most prevalent at 6.4% of the people with disabilities, followed by cognitive disability, (5.4%); independent living disability, (5.3%); hearing disability, (3.9%); self-care disability, (2.6%); and visual disability, (1.9%). Further examination and analysis are called for to discern more specifically the types of disabilities and/or conditions described as independent living and self-care disabilities.

163,200 (34.8%) Washingtonians with a disability age 16 – 64 are employed while 2,890,500 (71%) Washingtonians without a disability in the same age group are employed. In order to close the employment gap between those with a disability and those without a disability in Washington, an additional 59,242 individuals would need to become employed. However, further investigation needs to occur to determine whether individuals in this population have disabilities sufficiently severe to warrant DSHS/DVR services, would like to utilize the services of DSHS/DVR or are voluntarily out of the work force.

Comparison of DSHS/DVR Case Service Data with the 2011 ACS Data

A comparison of FFY 2011 data demographic characteristics of DSHS/DVR case service data for cases closed where eligibility was determined with ACS 2011 estimates for individuals age 16 – 64 with any disability in Washington. In FFY 2011 DSHS/DVR closed 9,744 cases. Comparing this data to ACS data shows that:

Male/Female

The higher proportion of DSHS/DVR cases closed for men than women is consistent with the higher proportion of men than women reporting a disability statewide. Though DSHS/DVR closed more men (57.4%) than men reporting a disability statewide (51.3%), DSHS/DVR closed fewer women with disabilities (42.6%) than women reporting a disability

FFY 2015 Attachment 4.11(a) – Results of Comprehensive Statewide Assessment of the Rehabilitation Needs of Individuals with Disabilities and Need to Establish, Develop, or Improve Community Rehabilitation Programs

statewide (48.7%).

Race/Ethnicity

By race and ethnicity in Washington State, DSHS/DVR served a higher proportion of cases for all race/ethnicity populations reporting a disability, including Black/African American, Native American or Alaskan Native, Asian, and Hispanic.

Geographic Locations

ACS does not publish 1-year estimates for small subpopulations by geographic areas; however a sample of 11 counties were viewed to identify the percentage of individuals with disabilities within the county compared with the percentage of DSHS/DVR customers served within that geographic area.

Of the counties that were compared, three revealed significant information for DSHS/DVR service delivery:

- King County, the largest metropolitan area in the state, comprises 7.8% of the state's disability population, yet 24.8% of the DSHS/DVR cases closed were in that county.
- Island County, a small rural area, comprises 12.4% of the state's disability population, yet represented the smallest proportion (.38%) of cases closed in relation to the entire DSHS/DVR caseload.
- Cowlitz County, a mid-sized rural area, comprises the highest percentage of people reporting a disability, 20.8%, yet only 3.1% of DSHS/DVR cases were closed in that county.

DSHS/DVR will conduct further analysis of disability populations by geographic area and DSHS/DVR customer populations to identify locations where service delivery needs to be adjusted to more closely reflect the needs of working-age individuals with disabilities.

Youth in Transition

Comparing 2011 ACS 1-year estimates for individuals age 16 – 20 years old with DSHS/DVR's cases age 16 – 20 with eligibility, the statewide population consists of 5.7% youth with disabilities, compared to 14.7% of DSHS/DVR's cases that were in this age range.

Under IDEA, Part B, Washington State reported serving 6,843 students age 18 – 21 in 2011 whereas DSHS/DVR closed 1,423 cases with eligibility determined for individuals 18 – 21 years old.

SSI/SSDI Recipients Age 18-64

For the year 2011, estimates for Social Security disability recipients age 18 – 64 in Washington and in the DSHS/DVR caseload with eligibility determined were compared.

For SSI recipients:

- 2.1% of the Washington State population received SSI

FFY 2015 Attachment 4.11(a) – Results of Comprehensive Statewide Assessment of the Rehabilitation Needs of Individuals with Disabilities and Need to Establish, Develop, or Improve Community Rehabilitation Programs

- 18.5% of DSHS/DVR cases closed received SSI.

For SSDI Recipients:

- 4.1% of the Washington State population received SSDI
- 38.5% of DSHS/DVR cases closed received SSDI

Customer Satisfaction Survey Conducted by the Washington State Rehabilitation Council (WSRC) – Results

In June 2012 the WSRC published the results of a statewide customer satisfaction telephone survey. The survey was conducted by the Department of Social and Health Services Office of Research and Data Analysis and yielded a response rate of 88.4% with a margin of error +/- 1.67%

The focus of the survey was conducted to determine the opinions of DSHS/DVR customers in regard to whether:

1. Services were provided in a respectful manner; and
2. Services included in their Individual Plans for Employment were likely to assist them in becoming employed.

Confirmation of Many Things Done Well

- More than 90% of all survey respondents strongly agree or agree that DSHS/DVR services were provided in a respectful manner.
- Between 87.9% and 90% of survey respondents currently implementing an Individual Plan for Employment strongly agree or agree that their counselors want them to succeed.
- Of those respondents who became employed after receiving services from DSHS/DVR, 74.6% are working as many hours as they want to work.
- 80.6% of respondents with closed cases affirmed that they are better off financially than before receiving DSHS/DVR services.

Findings that Merit Further Study or Action

- The primary purpose of DSHS/DVR is to assist jobseekers with disabilities to address barriers to employment. Given that, it is both curious and concerning that regardless of whether a survey respondent is currently implementing an Individual Plan for Employment, or has a closed case (with or without employment), 33-39% strongly disagree or disagree that DSHS/DVR has helped them work with disability issues that have prevented them from getting a job.

FFY 2015 Attachment 4.11(a) – Results of Comprehensive Statewide Assessment of the Rehabilitation Needs of Individuals with Disabilities and Need to Establish, Develop, or Improve Community Rehabilitation Programs

- It was noted that of survey respondents currently implementing an Individual Plan for Employment, those with a plan open for 961-1400 days are less certain of their next step than those in plan for 61-420 days.
- Although we do not know how the survey respondents define the term “skill,” it is notable that between 29.3% and 46.4% of survey respondents strongly disagreed or disagreed that they by working with DSHS/DVR they were learning skills to get and keep a job.
- Close to 29% of those who became employed after receiving DSHS/DVR services responded that they had not retained work

WSRC Recommendations from the Survey

DSHS/DVR is implementing the following WSRC recommendations that emanated from the Customer Satisfaction Survey:

Addressing Barriers to Employment

1. Assure that VR Counselors are supported by their supervisors and by administration to take the time to identify and understand the barriers to employment the customer faces.
2. Encourage VR Counselors to provide ongoing assessment (particularly for those with plans open for extended periods) to identify the disability-specific services and supports available to address barriers that emerge following plan development.
3. Identify strategies and implement practices to improve and enhance the continuity of communication between vocational rehabilitation counselors and customers, particularly during instances of delay or transitions between vendors or case transfers.

Customer Informed Choice

1. Place greater emphasis on the customer’s role in the vocational rehabilitation process during intake and orientation. We encourage DSHS/DVR to reinforce that emphasis over the life of the case.
2. Support staff providing direct service to strengthen community resource information and referral activities during the life of a plan by developing and updating their knowledge of the resources other than DSHS/DVR available to customers in local communities.
3. Require VR Counselors to clearly delineate sequential steps in the achievement of the Individual Plan for Employment. Celebrate/acknowledge movement from one step to the next.

FFY 2015 Attachment 4.11(a) – Results of Comprehensive Statewide Assessment of the Rehabilitation Needs of Individuals with Disabilities and Need to Establish, Develop, or Improve Community Rehabilitation Programs

Equity of Service Provision

Further research and analyze case notes and authorizations for payment for formal education and training across the state to determine if there are variances in interpretations of policies, procedures, and practices between DSHS/DVR offices. Issue clarification and additional guidance, as needed, based on DSHS/DVR's research and analysis.

~~WSRC Quarterly Customer Forums~~

~~Each quarter, between January 2012 and April 2013, the WSRC conducted Customer Forums at various locations across the state. These forums invited all DSHS/DVR customers with open cases within the geographic area to share feedback with the WSRC concerning their service delivery experiences. Generally, the majority of attendees at these forums came to express concerns or seek resolution to individual issues. Staff from the Client Assistance Program as well as DSHS/DVR staff were present at each forum to meet individually with customers after the event to address individualized concerns.~~

~~January 26, 2012 – Seattle, Washington~~

~~Three weeks before the event we sent a notice of public meeting to all customers with open cases in King County.~~

Total Invited	Total Comments (In-Person)	Total Telephone Comments/Inquiries	Total E-mail Comments	Total Comments Sent by Mail
3,742	48	68	23	2
Percentage of total Customers invited	1.2%	1.8%	0.61%	.053%

~~Observations about demographics:~~

~~At this forum was a wealth of representation of American-born people of color, and immigrant or refugee customers. Customers disclosed coming from: Eastern Europe, Bolivia, China, Mexico, Samoa, Somalia, and Vietnam. We were pleased that customers from varied backgrounds felt welcome and motivated to attend.~~

~~The diversity among the customer base highlights that supporting DSHS/DVR staff to develop or refine competency in a range of disability cultures and immigrant cultures (with a focus on those cultures' perceptions of disability) is becoming increasingly important to the agency's ability to serve customers and to help them achieve rehabilitation. Here we want to emphasize that we understand that providing culturally competent services extends beyond providing language interpreters. We believe it involves having enough experience with a culture to understand values, mores, and customs in a disability context. We realize this is a significant challenge. We recognize that all VR agencies find it difficult to recruit and retain qualified staff with these competencies.~~

~~The general customer feedback:~~

FFY 2015 Attachment 4.11(a) – Results of Comprehensive Statewide Assessment of the Rehabilitation Needs of Individuals with Disabilities and Need to Establish, Develop, or Improve Community Rehabilitation Programs

- ~~• We noticed that fewer customers who attended this forum conveyed an understanding of the vocational rehabilitation process than those who attended recent forums; and,~~
- ~~• A number of customers highlighted issues regarding communication. In some cases communication was infrequent, in other cases communication between DVR, the customer, a CRP, or an independent living vendor was unclear or infrequent.~~

Specific comments (sorted by topic):

Topic: Appreciation (5 related comments)

- ~~1. I appreciate DVR~~
- ~~2. I appreciate DVR communicating with people through video phones and interpreters – positive; thanks~~
- ~~3. I am grateful to DVR for helping~~
- ~~4. I started with DVR in 1980 – my counselor was very good and helpful to me – my 1st job was at General Electric – 10 years manual labor – I was told it was a stepping stone to Boeing. I worked at Boeing for 3 and half years and was laid off; another job then another lay off – Thank you DVR.~~
- ~~5. I have been a client for years; I have received very good services.~~

Topic: Communication/Timeliness (15 related comments)

- ~~1. My son signed up (for DVR services) a year ago and I haven't heard much. That sounds somewhat usual.~~
- ~~2. Everything takes months or longer; if I could do it myself, I would.~~
- ~~3. I took 3 years leave from DVR. Now I have been with DVR for 2 years looking for a job – difficult – still not working need a job to meet financial needs. I was with DVR 5 years ago and had a small part time job. I was not sure of my skills and went to school. Now I have finished my degree.~~
- ~~4. Communication is not always clear.~~
- ~~5. It has been 21 years – nothing; I know DVR has great people, but...~~
- ~~6. I signed a paper and I keep calling; I hear nothing. I understand they are busy, but no one is answering the phone.~~
- ~~7. On June 5th in Kent I had a meeting; It was a long wait – no one e-mailed back, I would go into the office – everyone busy – I called got no calls back...~~
- ~~8. I call and get no response; no call backs.~~
- ~~9. Started out good – put to work for 4 weeks; They paid money to write resume – case transferred – waiting for new person (don't know if they are waiting for a new VRC or CRP staff).~~
- ~~10. I have a suggestion – do partnerships with other agencies – I find poor communication with agencies; need accountability with clients some are good some are bad.~~
- ~~11. It is a long wait – kept going to different offices; finally have a meeting February 13th.~~
- ~~12. My assumption was that I would be guided to help me understand what would be best. In 2002 I went to work 2 times. On my own I found temporary work; then I~~

FFY 2015 Attachment 4.11(a) – Results of Comprehensive Statewide Assessment of the Rehabilitation Needs of Individuals with Disabilities and Need to Establish, Develop, or Improve Community Rehabilitation Programs

- ~~found the second job on my own.~~
~~13. I might be further along if it is understood I want a job.~~
~~14. With DVR for 1 year; not much help; find stuff on my own.~~
~~15. A lot of us fall through the cracks; on paper it looks good — need to know what's really happening in our lives.~~

~~Topic: Understanding of the Vocational Rehabilitation Process/ Informed Choice (4 related comments)~~

- ~~1. I got a letter from DVR because I was employed — service stopped. I am not working now — had to reregister with DVR a couple of months ago I haven't met with anyone yet.~~
- ~~2. If a person does not know how to self-advocate they can run into a lot of walls. If you don't know what to ask...~~
- ~~3. I was on a wait list 3 years ago; I graduated 2 and half years ago; DVR never made it clear to me what was available unless I asked; I had to ask about help with books, bus pass. What if you do not know what to ask for?~~
- ~~4. I was not informed of what services were available; I did not know what to ask for; my MH Counseling was for 6 visits that was all available.~~

~~Topic: Comparable Benefit Scarcity (2 related comments)~~

- ~~1. Someone told me that there were 24 visits available (with a mental health counselor); that's very limited.~~
- ~~2. When need MH services — DVR does not provide.~~

~~Topic: Unspecific Challenges (1 related comment)~~

- ~~1. I've been looking for a job with DVR for many years; it is difficult to find work.~~

~~Topic: Miscellaneous (1 related comment)~~

- ~~1. It would be nice if they (DVR) covered medical alternative therapies that are available.~~

~~Topic: Issues with Other Partners (3 related comments)~~

- ~~1. Veterans Service referred me to DVR — services I have received are not what I thought they would be — “paperwork only.”~~
- ~~2. Work Source was not helpful for doing a professional resume; if I had a question they don't know the answer.~~
- ~~3. At the Work Source you can only use the computer for 2 hours and at the Seattle Public Library for 1.5 hours — not enough time to do what you need to do — sometimes this may seem like a little thing but it may mean a big thing for my success.~~

April 19, 2012 — Wenatchee Washington

~~On April 19th the Council hosted its second quarterly forum of the year at the Red Lion Inn in~~

FFY 2015 Attachment 4.11(a) – Results of Comprehensive Statewide Assessment of the Rehabilitation Needs of Individuals with Disabilities and Need to Establish, Develop, or Improve Community Rehabilitation Programs

~~Wenatchee. We produced an English/Spanish notice of invitation. Of the 196 customers in Chelan County invited to attend only one joined us. Based on that turnout we did not garner enough feedback to produce a useful report.~~

~~July 30, 2012 – Richland, Washington~~

~~Three weeks before the event we sent a notice of public meeting to all customers with open cases in the Kennewick Office. This is different from our typical practice because we usually invite customers with cases open in a county. Because the Kennewick Office serves customers from more than one county we made that decision.~~

Total Invited	Total Customers who signed in (In-Person)	Total Telephone Comments/Inquiries	Total E-mail Comments	Total Comments Sent by Mail
549	15	8	0	0
Percentage of total Customers invited	2.7%	1.4%	-	-

~~Observations about demographics:~~

- ~~• The Council continues to notice that Deaf customers are turning out at our forums in rural areas and cities alike.~~
- ~~• Although it's no surprise to those who live in Area 1, transportation access or lack thereof is a systemic issue which creates barriers to employment that may be less prevalent in communities that make greater investments in transportation infrastructure.~~
- ~~• More Spanish speakers expressed interest in joining us than we receive in most areas.~~
- ~~• Local people have begun to notice a sharp downturn in the economy. Although Hanford was hiring for a time and driving the economy, recently there have been layoffs. Local VRCs are noticing fewer retail positions available.~~

~~The general customer feedback:~~

- ~~• One man with significant hearing loss talked about how pleased he was with his experience at DVR. He was trained to be a teacher and shared that he had recently interviewed for a position. He had a lot of good things to say about his services in Kennewick.~~

FFY 2015 Attachment 4.11(a) – Results of Comprehensive Statewide Assessment of the Rehabilitation Needs of Individuals with Disabilities and Need to Establish, Develop, or Improve Community Rehabilitation Programs

- A person employed by the Department of Labor & Industries expressed confusion about who DVR serves. She also was advocating for more communication and partnering with the local office.
- A Deaf woman who relocated from Tacoma to Tri-Cities addressed frustration with aspects of her vocational rehabilitation process. She experienced turnover in the VRCs providing guidance and counseling to her. She had entered Columbia Basin Community College with one career goal in mind and the hope of completing a degree. After ongoing frustration securing interpreters she will be coming away with a certificate and thinks she may need to change career goals even though it wouldn't be her first choice.
- Two advocates who work for an agency that serves people who are Deaf discussed their work and the good relationship they are cultivating with the Kennewick Office.

October 25, 2012 – Vancouver, Washington

Three weeks before the event we sent a notice of public meeting to all customers with open cases in the Kelso and Vancouver offices.

Total Invited	Total Customers who signed in (In-Person)	Total Telephone Comments/Inquiries	Total E-mail Comments	Total Comments Sent by Mail
820	15	7	4	4
Percentage of total Customers invited	1.8%	0.85%	0.12%	0.12%

The general customer feedback:

We noticed a positive tone at this forum. A few speakers expressed satisfaction with the services and support they received from their counselors. When people shared having experienced difficulty or bottlenecks the concerns seemed to be more about the economy than with DVR.

- The first speaker shared a depth of gratitude and satisfaction about his experience with DVR. The customer had reduced his weight by nearly 300 lbs. He said that his counselor believed in him “until I could believe in myself again.” The customer was very inspirational and excited to return to his previous field where he worked as a hair dresser.
- A man, who identified himself as an advocate for a young DVR customer working with DVR and a GRP, suggested that DVR counselors might consider talking with customers to verify whether the information included in the monthly reports from GRPs about actions taken on their behalf are accurate.

FFY 2015 Attachment 4.11(a) – Results of Comprehensive Statewide Assessment of the Rehabilitation Needs of Individuals with Disabilities and Need to Establish, Develop, or Improve Community Rehabilitation Programs

- A 55 year old man who progressed from being hard of hearing to being Deaf explained multiple efforts he had made in different fields to find work after being laid off when his company was bought out. He provided two examples where it had been acceptable to have an AA but then required a BA. He expressed frustration about BA requirements and about the requirement to communicate by phone. This man also expressed deep appreciation and rapport with Kay Kennedy. He is frustrated by turnover among DVR counselors with ASL language skill and cultural competency.
- The father of a young woman with a developmental disability discussed the efforts underway to help his daughter secure employment after they relocated from Seattle to Vancouver. He articulated a belief that increases in the state minimum wage resulted in reduced work opportunities for his daughter and advocated that there be arrangements for people with disabilities to earn less than minimum wage.
- A man in his thirties discussed his experience with community-based assessment and the difference between the work he wanted and the kind of positions he was being assessed for. He then touched on the general difficulties of finding work.
- A woman with a background in psychiatric nursing who expressed anxiety being around others, expressed difficulty finding an appropriate placement. She raised questions about reasonable accommodations.
- A couple (a man and a woman) in their very early twenties who were Deaf were confused and off put by the variation in their experiences with DVR. The man was quite satisfied with his services, with communication, and case progress. The young woman had the complete opposite experience. Their point was about consistency of practice.

January 17, 2013 – Sea Tac, Washington and April 18, 2013 – Everett, Washington

On January 17 we held the first quarterly forum of the year at Red Lion, Sea Tac Airport, Seattle, WA. Invitations were sent to roughly 3,500 customers (all customers with open cases in King County).

On April 18 we held our second quarterly forum of the year at the Holiday Inn, Everett, WA. One thousand ninety customers were invited to attend, all those with open cases in Snohomish County.

Three weeks before the events we sent a notice of public meeting to all customers with open cases in King and Snohomish Counties.

Total Invited	Total Customers who signed in (In-Person)
--------------------------	--

FFY 2015 Attachment 4.11(a) – Results of Comprehensive Statewide Assessment of the Rehabilitation Needs of Individuals with Disabilities and Need to Establish, Develop, or Improve Community Rehabilitation Programs

4,590 (3,500 King Co), (1,090 Snohomish Co)	72 (55 King Co.) (17 Snohomish)
Percentage of total Customers invited	1.56%

The general customer feedback:

January Observations

The turnout at the January forum was significant. The room was full of energy. There were times it felt like a powder keg and times it felt like a tent revival. Our members noticed:

- A strong representative sample of the customer issues DVR staff are presented with in their daily work;
- Despite the fact that King County has more resources than less populated areas, the need for additional supports and services for people with psychiatric disabilities was plainly evident;
- Recurrent theme of discussion: frustration with lack of communication between DVR staff and customers;
- There was significant frustration in the room about long-term unemployment and grief expressed over the consequences (such as foreclosure, loss of confidence, general scarcity);
- Some customers expressed a recognition that they needed to take ownership in their own VR process;
- There was a strong contingent of customers with conviction histories discussing the layered experiences of disability and incarceration as a barrier to employment;
- There was a notable presence of Deaf people from the US and other countries including Mexico and Bolivia;
- Speakers at this forum generally offered lengthier personal narratives; and,
- A greater number of customers disclosed a need to support children.

April Observations

- The first speaker was a man with a traumatic brain injury who had been working with DVR for five or six years. He discussed a need to build confidence as part of an effort to reenter the workforce;

FFY 2015 Attachment 4.11(a) – Results of Comprehensive Statewide Assessment of the Rehabilitation Needs of Individuals with Disabilities and Need to Establish, Develop, or Improve Community Rehabilitation Programs

- ~~• The second speaker had worked with two offices, Smokey Point and Lynnwood. She experienced customer service issues and concluded that one office was not “very interested in helping.” She characterized herself as one “not to give up easily.” She said that DVR was a great help with her barriers but then listed a bunch of unaddressed barriers;~~
- ~~• The third speaker was appreciative. Her case had been open for a long time. The customer expressed that she was told she provided too much information;~~
- ~~• The fourth speaker recounted the way that unreliable transit had cost him a job;~~
- ~~• The fifth speaker was relatively new to the VR process, having recently been determined eligible, he just had general questions;~~
- ~~• The next speaker articulated the value of Work Strides and Dependable Strengths. He had been through a number of assessments but was still facing barriers; and,~~
- ~~• The final speaker discussed having started her own business and was quite positive about her experience with the division.~~

DSHS/DVR Monthly Survey of Customers with Closed Cases

Each month DSHS/DVR mails a survey to all customers during that month whose case was Closed-Rehabilitated or Closed-Other, After IPE Commenced. The summary below reflects a compilation of customer survey responses from FFY 2011 and FFY 2012. During those two years a total of 9,974 surveys were mailed to customers (5,373, Closed Rehabilitated; 4,601, Closed-Other, After IPE Commenced). The survey response rate was 26.0%, Closed Rehabilitated, and 19.0%, Closed-Other, After IPE Commenced.

Close Rehabilitated

Over 90.0% of Respondents Strongly Agreed or Agreed with the following:

- I was given enough information to understand how DVR could help me with employment
- DVR Listened to me
- DVR answered my questions
- DVR understood my problems in getting and keeping a job
- DVR treated me with courtesy and respect

Between 80.0% - 89.0% of Respondents Strongly Agreed or Agreed with the following:

- I chose my employment goal
- DVR explained what services were available to me
- DVR returned my phone calls quickly

FFY 2015 Attachment 4.11(a) – Results of Comprehensive Statewide Assessment of the Rehabilitation Needs of Individuals with Disabilities and Need to Establish, Develop, or Improve Community Rehabilitation Programs

- I received services in my DVR employment plan quickly enough
- I like the work I do
- DVR does good work
- Overall, DVR helped me

Between 70.0% - 79.0% of Respondents Strongly Agreed or Agreed with the following:

- DVR gave me information about other programs that could help me
- I chose where to get services in my DVR employment plan
- If I had complaints or concerns about services, I was satisfied with how DVR responded
- I use my skills and abilities that are most important to me in my job
- Overall, I am satisfied with my job

Between 60.0% - 69.0% of Respondents Strongly Agreed or Agreed with the following:

- My pay is enough for my basic needs

Between 50.0% - 59.0% of Respondents Strongly Agreed or Agreed with the following:

- I am satisfied with my employee benefits

Closed-Other, After IPE Commenced

Between 70.0% - 79.0% of Respondents Strongly Agreed or Agreed with the following:

- I chose my employment goal
- DVR explained what services were available to me
- DVR returned my phone calls
- DVR treated me with courtesy and respect

Between 60.0% - 69.0% of Respondents Strongly Agreed or Agreed with the following:

- I was given enough information to understand how DVR could help me with employment
- DVR listened to me
- DVR answered my questions

Between 50.0% - 59.0% of Respondents Strongly Agreed or Agreed with the following:

- DVR gave me information about other programs that could help me
- I chose where to get services in my DVR employment plan
- DVR understood my problems in getting and keeping a job
- I received services in my DVR employment plan quickly enough

Between 40.0% - 49.0% of Respondents Strongly Agreed or Agreed with the following:

- If I had complaints or concerns about services, I was satisfied with how DVR responded

FFY 2015 Attachment 4.11(a) – Results of Comprehensive Statewide Assessment of the Rehabilitation Needs of Individuals with Disabilities and Need to Establish, Develop, or Improve Community Rehabilitation Programs

Respondents were asked to select the main reason they stopped DVR services before achieving an employment outcome. The following lists the number of responses to each reason.

- I found a job on my own = 31
- DVR did not have services to meet my needs = 111
- It took too long to get the services I needed = 136
- I was not satisfied with the services I received = 156
- My disability worsened = 217
- I decided not to get a job = 53

Respondents that indicated they were not satisfied with services were requested to select the reason for their dissatisfaction. The following lists the number of responses to each reason.

- The location of the DVR Office was not convenient = 29
- It took too long to get services = 148
- The available services were not what I needed = 106
- I did not get along with DVR staff = 56
- The services were not helpful = 141

Statewide Public Forum Comments – State Plan (TO BE INSERTED)

CSNA Survey Results – DSHS/DVR Customers, Staff & Collateral Service Providers

Between September 2013 and February 2014 CCER sent online needs assessment surveys to DSHS/DVR customers, staff, and collateral service providers. A CSNA Steering Committee comprised of DSHS/DVR, WSRC, and CCER staff developed the survey questions. All questions were the same for each survey group. The following summarizes key results from each group.

Customer Survey

The online survey was distributed to 10,774 current and recently closed DSHS/DVR customers. A total of 1,552 individuals responded for a response rate of approximately 15.0 percent. This included responses from 1,047 current customers and 505 recently closed customers.

Customer respondents most frequently identified the following as the services that they require from DSHS/DVR:

Placement in to a job (56.0%)

Assistance searching for a job (53.0%)

FFY 2015 Attachment 4.11(a) – Results of Comprehensive Statewide Assessment of the Rehabilitation Needs of Individuals with Disabilities and Need to Establish, Develop, or Improve Community Rehabilitation Programs

Community college or other vocational training (41.0%)

Job coaching at work (39.0%)

Customer respondents most frequently identified the following challenges to receiving services from DSHS/DVR:

Need more time with the VR Counselor (36.0%)

Wait a long time for services to begin (30.0%)

Do not understand all the services that are available (30.0%)

Difficulty developing an Individualized Plan for Employment (30.0%)

Staff Survey

The online survey was distributed to 247 DSHS/DVR staff. A total of 147 individuals responded for a response rate of approximately 60.0 percent.

Staff respondents most frequently identified the following as the services that customers require from DSHS/DVR:

Vocational counseling and guidance (86.0%)

Mental health counseling and treatment (78.0%)

Placement in to a job (77.0%)

Assistance searching for a job (66.0%)

Transportation (61.0%)

Job coaching at work (58.0%)

Social Security benefits Planning (51.0%)

Community college or other vocational training (48.0%)

Staff respondents most frequently identified the following challenges to customers receiving services from DSHS/DVR:

Customer health issues prevent customer from regularly meeting with VR Counselor (58.0%)

Customer does not understand all the services that are available (50.0%)

Customer disagrees with what VR services are required to achieve their employment goal (25.0%)

Getting to DSHS/DVR office using public transportation (23.0%)

Collateral Service Provider Survey

The online survey was distributed to a wide array of organizations and agencies that frequently jointly serve DSHS/DVR customers. A total of 355 respondents completed the survey. A total response rate could not be calculated because it is not know the exact number of individuals that organizations and agencies distributed the survey link to.

FFY 2015 Attachment 4.11(a) – Results of Comprehensive Statewide Assessment of the Rehabilitation Needs of Individuals with Disabilities and Need to Establish, Develop, or Improve Community Rehabilitation Programs

The majority of collateral service provider responses came from the following entities: WorkSource; Community Rehabilitation Programs, Developmental Disabilities Programs, and Mental Health Providers.

Collateral service provider respondents most frequently identified the following as the services that customers require from DSHS/DVR:

Placement in to a job (74.0%)

Job coaching at work (69.0%)

Assistance searching for a job (66.0%)

General work attitude and behavior (57.0%)

Vocational counseling and guidance (56.0%)

Collateral service provider respondents most frequently identified the following challenges to customers receiving services from DSHS/DVR:

Customer does not understand all the services that are available (63.0%)

Customers wait a long time for services to begin (31.0%)

Customer disagrees with what VR services are required to achieve their employment goal (24.0%)

Need more time with the VR Counselor (24.0%)